arXiv:hep-th/9410022v1 4 Oct 1994

Minimal Affinizations of Representations
# of Quantum Groups:
the Rank 2 Case

Vyjayanthi Chari[1],

Department of Mathematics,

University of California, Riverside, CA 92521.

Introduction

If $\mathfrak{g}$ is a finite–dimensional complex simple Lie algebra, the associated 'untwisted' affine Lie algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a central extension, with one–dimensional centre, of the space of Laurent polynomial maps $\mathbb{C}^\times \to \mathfrak{g}$ (on which a Lie bracket is defined using pointwise operations). Since the cocycle of the extension vanishes on the constant maps, we can regard $\mathfrak{g}$ as a subalgebra of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$. If V is any representation of $\mathfrak{g}$, it is easy to extend the action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on V to an action of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ on the same space. If $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, evaluation at a gives a homomorphism $ev_a : \hat{\mathfrak{g}} \to \mathfrak{g}$ (under which the centre maps to zero) which is the identity on $\mathfrak{g}$, so pulling back V by ev_a gives the desired extension. It follows from the results of [2] that, if V is finite–dimensional and irreducible, these are, up to isomorphism, the only possible extensions.

Quantum deformations $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of the universal enveloping algebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ were introduced in 1985 by V. G. Drinfel'd and M. Jimbo. These algebras depend on a parameter $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$; we assume throughout this paper that q is transcendental. It is well–known (see [5] or [9], for example) that, up to twisting by certain simple automorphisms, there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the finite–dimensional representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and those of $\mathfrak{g}$. Corresponding representations have the same character, and hence the same dimension. However, the structure of the finite–dimensional representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is not well–understood. A parametrization of these representations in the spirit of Cartan's highest weight classification of the finite-dimensional irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ is proved in the case $\mathfrak{g} = sl_2$ in [3], and in [6] in general.

As in the classical situation, we may regard $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ as a subalgebra of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type sl_n, the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ on any representation V extends to a representation of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. However, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type sl_n, it is not usually possible to extend the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ on an irreducible finite–dimensional representation V to an action of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ on V. Thus, it is natural to ask how V can be 'enlarged' so as to obtain a representation of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. To make this question precise, we define in this paper a natural partial ordering on the set of isomorphism classes of representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. By an *affinization* of a finite-dimensional irreducible representation V of

---

[1] Partially supported by the NSF, DMS-9207701

$U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, we mean an irreducible representation $\hat{V}$ of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ which contains V as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-subrepresentation with multiplicity one, and such that all other irreducible $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-subrepresentations of $\hat{V}$ are strictly smaller than V. (There is a clear analogy with the classical Harish Chandra theory of $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-modules here.)

We prove that any given representation V has only finitely many affinizations (at least one) up to $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-isomorphism, and one may ask if any of them is 'canonical'. A reasonable interpretation of this question is to look for the minimal affinization(s) of V, with respect to our partial order. If $\mathfrak{g} = sl_n$, we show in [4] that every finite-dimensional irreducible representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ has, up to $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-isomorphism, a unique minimal affinization. In this paper, we prove that, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type C_2 or G_2, there is again a unique minimal affinization, and we describe it precisely in terms of the highest weight classification of representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ mentioned above. In contrast to the sl_n case, the minimal affinization in these cases is not, in general, irreducible as a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Subsequent papers will deal with the case when $\mathfrak{g}$ has rank greater than 2.

The problem of constructing affinizations of representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is important in several areas of mathematics and physics, as has been emphasized by I. B. Frenkel and N. Yu. Reshetikhin, among others (see Remark 4.2 in [8]). As one example, recall that, to any finite-dimensional irreducible representation V of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ one can associate an R-matrix, i.e. an element $R \in \mathrm{End}(V \otimes V)$ which satisfies the 'quantum Yang–Baxter equation' (QYBE). There are many situations, however, in which it is important to have a solution of the 'QYBE with spectral parameters'. This is so, for example, in the theory of lattice models in statistical mechanics, for only when the R-matrix constructed from the Boltzmann weights of the model satisfies the QYBE with spectral parameters can one prove the existence of commuting transfer matrices and deduce the integrability of the model. (See [5], for example, for an introduction to these ideas.) Thus, it is natural to ask when R can be 'embedded'

in a parameter-dependent R-matrix $R(u) \in \mathrm{End}(V \otimes V)$. A sufficient condition for this is that the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ on V extends to an action of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ on V, for then V itself can be embedded in a 1-parameter family of representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by twisting with a certain 1-parameter family of automorphisms of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ (which correspond, in the classical case, to 'rescaling' the $\mathbb{C}^\times$ parameter in $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$).

A second example concerns the affine Toda field theory associated to $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$. This admits $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^*)$ as a 'quantum symmetry group', where $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ is the dual affine Lie algebra (whose generalized Cartan matrix is the transpose of that of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$). It is well known that the classical solitons of this theory correspond essentially to the finite-dimensional irreducible representations of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$. The solitons (or particle states) of the quantum theory should therefore correspond to the finite-dimensional irreducible representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^*)$. Since not all representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ are affinizable on the same space, the quantum solitons come in 'multiplets', and there are generally 'more' quantum solitons than classical ones.

1 Quantum affine algebras

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a finite–dimensional complex simple Lie algebra with Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ and Cartan matrix $A = (a\ )$ Fix coprime positive integers $(d\ )$ such that

(d_ia_{ij}) is symmetric. Let R be the set of roots and R^+ a set of positive roots. The roots can be regarded as functions $I \to \mathbb{Z}$; in particular, the simple roots $\alpha_i \in R^+$ are given by

$$\alpha_i(j) = a_{ji}, \qquad (i, j \in I).$$

Let $Q = \oplus_{i\in I}\mathbb{Z}.\alpha_i \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ be the root lattice, and set $Q^+ = \sum_{i\in I}\mathbb{N}.\alpha_i$.

A weight is an arbitrary function $\lambda : I \to \mathbb{Z}$; denote the set of weights by P, and let

$$P^+ = \{\lambda \in P : \lambda(i) \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in I\}$$

be the set of dominant weights. Define a partial order $\geq$ on P by

$$\lambda \geq \mu \ \text{ iff } \lambda - \mu \in Q^+.$$

Let θ be the unique highest root with respect to $\geq$.

Define a non–degenerate symmetric bilinear form $(\ ,\ )$ on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ by

$$(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = d_ia_{ij},$$

and denote by $(\ ,\ )$ also the induced form on $\mathfrak{h}$. Set $d_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\theta, \theta)$, $a_{00} = 2$, and, for all $i \in I$,

$$a_{0i} = -\frac{2(\theta, \alpha_i)}{(\theta, \theta)}, \ \ a_{i0} = -\frac{2(\theta, \alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}.$$

Let $\hat{I} = I \amalg \{0\}$ and $\hat{A} = (a_{ij})_{i,j\in\hat{I}}$. Then, $\hat{A}$ is the generalized Cartan matrix of the untwisted affine Lie algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ associated to $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ be transcendental, and, for $r, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq r$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
[n]_q &= \frac{q^n - q^{-n}}{q - q^{-1}},\\
[n]_q! &= [n]_q[n-1]_q \ldots [2]_q[1]_q,\\
\begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix}_q &= \frac{[n]_q!}{[r]_q![n-r]_q!}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $i \in \hat{I}$, let $q_i = q^{d_i}$.

Definition 1.1. *With the above notation, $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is the unital associative algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ with generators $x_i^{\pm}$, $k_i^{\pm 1}$ ($i \in \hat{I}$), and the following defining relations:*

$$\begin{aligned}
k_ik_i^{-1} = k_i^{-1}k_i = 1, \ \ k_ik_j &= k_jk_i,\\
k_ix_j^{\pm}k_i^{-1} &= q_i^{\pm a_{ij}}x_j^{\pm},\\
[x_i^+, x_j^-] &= \delta_{ij}\frac{k_i - k_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{r=0}^{1-a_{ij}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - a_{ij} \\ r \end{bmatrix}_{q_i} (x_i^{\pm})^r x_j^{\pm} (x_i^{\pm})^{1-a_{ij}-r} = 0, \qquad i \neq j. \tag{1}$$

The algebra with generators $x_i^{\pm}$, $k_i^{\pm 1}$ ($i \in I$) and the above defining relations (with the indices i, j restricted to I) is denoted by $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

Note that there is a canonical homomorphism of algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \to U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ which takes $x_i^{\pm} \to x_i^{\pm}$, $k_i^{\pm 1} \to k_i^{\pm 1}$ for all $i \in I$. The following result is well–known (see [5], for example).

Proposition 1.2. *$U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ has the structure of a Hopf algebra, with comultiplication Δ, counit ϵ, and antipode S, given by*

$$\begin{gathered}\Delta(x_i^+) = x_i^+ \otimes k_i + 1 \otimes x_i^+,\\ \Delta(x_i^-) = x_i^- \otimes 1 + k_i^{-1} \otimes x_i^-,\\ \Delta(k_i^{\pm 1}) = k_i^{\pm 1} \otimes k_i^{\pm 1},\\ \epsilon(x_i^{\pm}) = 0, \;\; \epsilon(k_i^{\pm 1}) = 1,\\ S(x_i^+) = -x_i^+ k_i^{-1}, \; S(x_i^-) = -k_i x_i^-, \; S(k_i^{\pm 1}) = k_i^{\mp 1},\end{gathered}$$

for all $i \in \hat{I}$. Moreover, $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is a Hopf algebra with structure maps given by the same formulas, but with the index i being restricted to the set I. $\square$

It is well–known that $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ may also be described as a central extension, with one–dimensional centre, of the loop algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, i.e. the space of Laurent polynomial maps $\mathbb{C}^\times \to \mathfrak{g}$ under pointwise operations. Drinfel'd [7] and Beck [1] give an analogous realization of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{A}_q$ be the unital associative algebra with generators $x_{i,r}^{\pm}$ ($i \in I$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$), $k_i^{\pm 1}$ ($i \in I$), $h_{i,r}$ ($i \in I$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$) and $c^{\pm 1/2}$, and the following defining relations:*

$$\begin{gathered} c^{\pm 1/2} \text{ are central,}\\ k_i k_i^{-1} = k_i^{-1} k_i = 1, \;\; c^{1/2} c^{-1/2} = c^{-1/2} c^{1/2} = 1,\\ k_i k_j = k_j k_i, \;\; k_i h_{j,r} = h_{j,r} k_i,\\ k_i x_{j,r} k_i^{-1} = q_i^{\pm a_{ij}} x_{j,r}^{\pm},\\ [h_{i,r}, x_{j,s}^{\pm}] = \pm \frac{1}{r} [r a_{ij}]_{q_i} c^{\mp |r|/2} x_{j,r+s}^{\pm},\\ x_{i,r+1}^{\pm} x_{j,s}^{\pm} - q_i^{\pm a_{ij}} x_{j,s}^{\pm} x_{i,r+1}^{\pm} = q_i^{\pm a_{ij}} x_{i,r}^{\pm} x_{j,s+1}^{\pm} - x_{j,s+1}^{\pm} x_{i,r}^{\pm},\\ [x_{i,r}^+, x_{j,s}^-] = \delta_{ij} \frac{c^{(r-s)/2} \phi_{i,r+s}^+ - c^{-(r-s)/2} \phi_{i,r+s}^-}{q_i - q_i^{-1}},\\ \sum_{\pi \in \Sigma_m} \sum_{k=0}^{m} (-1)^k \begin{bmatrix} m \\ k \end{bmatrix}_{q_i} x_{i,r_{\pi(1)}}^{\pm} \ldots x_{i,r_{\pi(k)}}^{\pm} x_{j,s}^{\pm} x_{i,r_{\pi(k+1)}}^{\pm} \ldots x_{i,r_{\pi(m)}}^{\pm} = 0, \quad i \neq j, \end{gathered}$$

for all sequences of integers $r_1, \ldots, r_m$, where $m = 1 - a_{ij}$, Σ_m is the symmetric group on m letters, and the $\phi_{i,r}^{\pm}$ are determined by equating powers of u in the formal power series

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \phi_{i,\pm r}^{\pm} u^{\pm r} = k_i^{\pm 1} exp \left(\pm (q_i - q_i^{-1}) \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} h_{i,\pm s} u^{\pm s} \right).$$

If $\theta = \sum_{i \in I} m_i \alpha_i$, set $k_\theta = \prod_{i \in I} k_i^{m_i}$. Suppose that the root vector $\overline{x}_\theta^+$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to θ is expressed in terms of the simple root vectors $\overline{x}_i^+$ ($i \in I$) of $\mathfrak{g}$ as *for some* $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}^\times$. *Define maps* $w_i^\pm : U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})\to U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ *by*

$$w_i^\pm(a) = x_{i,0}^\pm a - k_i^{\pm 1} a k_i^{\mp 1} x_{i,0}^\pm .$$

Then, there is an isomorphism of algebras $f : U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})\to \mathcal{A}_q$ *defined on generators by*

$$\begin{gathered} f(k_0)=k_\theta^{-1},\ f(k_i)=k_i,\ f(x_i^\pm)=x_{i,0}^\pm, \qquad (i\in I),\\ f(x_0^+)=\mu w_{i_1}^-\cdots w_{i_k}^-(x_{j,1}^-)k_\theta^{-1},\\ f(x_0^-)=\lambda k_\theta w_{i_1}^+\cdots w_{i_k}^+(x_{j,-1}^+), \end{gathered}$$

where $\mu\in\mathbb{C}^\times$ *is determined by the condition*

$$[x_0^+, x_0^-] = \frac{k_0-k_0^{-1}}{q_0-q_0^{-1}}. \quad \square$$

Let $\hat{U}^\pm$ (resp. $\hat{U}^0$) be the subalgebra of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ generated by the $x_{i,r}^\pm$ (resp. by the $\phi_{i,r}^\pm$) for all $i\in I$, $r\in\mathbb{Z}$. Similarly, let $U^\pm$ (resp. U^0) be the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by the $x_i^\pm$ (resp. by the $k_i^{\pm1}$) for all $i\in I$. It is not difficult to prove

Proposition 1.4. *(a)* $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) = U^-.U^0.U^+$.
(b) $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) = \hat{U}^-.\hat{U}^0.\hat{U}^+$. $\square$

It is clear that setting

$$deg(x_{i,r}^\pm) = deg(h_{i,r}) = r,\quad deg(c^{\pm1/2}) = deg(k_i^{\pm1}) = 0, \quad (i\in I,\ r\in\mathbb{Z})$$

gives $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ the structure of a graded algebra. The following result is a more precise formulation of this remark.

Proposition 1.5. *For all* $t\in\mathbb{C}^\times$, *there exists a Hopf algebra automorphism* τ_t *of* $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ *such that*

$$\begin{gathered} \tau_t(x_{i,r}^\pm) = t^r(x_{i,r}^\pm),\quad \tau_t(h_{i,r}) = t^r h_{i,r},\\ \tau_t(k_i^{\pm1}) = k_i^{\pm1},\quad \tau_t(c^{\pm1/2}) = c^{\pm1/2}. \end{gathered}$$

Proof. It is clear, as we have already said, that there is an algebra automorphism τ_t given on generators by the above formulas. To see that τ_t respects the coalgebra structure, note that, by the formula for the isomorphism f in 1.3,

$$\begin{gathered} \tau_t(x_i^\pm) = x_i^\pm,\quad \tau_t(k_i^{\pm1}) = k_i^{\pm1},\quad (i\in I),\\ \tau_t(x_0^\pm) = t^{\mp1}x_0^\pm,\quad \tau_t(k_0^{\pm1}) = k_0^{\pm1}. \end{gathered}$$

Using 1.2, it is easy to check that both sides of the equations

$$(\tau_t\otimes\tau_t)\circ\Delta = \Delta\circ\tau_t,\quad \tau_t\circ S = S\circ\tau_t$$

agree on the generators in 1.1, and hence on the whole of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. $\square$

The τ_t are the quantum analogues of the ‘translation’ automorphisms which take a loop $\ell:\mathbb{C}^\times\to\mathfrak{g}$ to the loop ℓ_t given by $\ell_t(u)=\ell(tu)$.

We shall also need to make use of the quantum analogue of the Cartan involution

Proposition 1.6. *There is a unique algebra involution* $\hat{\omega}$ *of* $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ *given on the generators of the presentation 1.3 by*

$$\begin{gathered}\hat{\omega}(x^{\pm}_{i,r}) = -x^{\mp}_{i,-r}, \;\; \hat{\omega}(h_{i,r}) = -h_{i,r}, \\ \hat{\omega}(\phi^{\pm}_{i,r}) = \phi^{\mp}_{i,-r}, \;\; \hat{\omega}(k_i^{\pm 1}) = k_i^{\mp 1}, \\ \hat{\omega}(c^{\pm 1/2}) = c^{\mp 1/2}.\end{gathered} \tag{2}$$

Moreover, we have

$$(\hat{\omega}\otimes\hat{\omega}) \circ \Delta = \Delta^{op} \circ \hat{\omega}, \tag{3}$$

$$\hat{\omega}^{-1} \circ S^{-1} \circ \hat{\omega} \circ S = \kappa, \tag{4}$$

where Δ^{op} *is the opposite comultiplication of* $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ *and* κ *is the Hopf algebra automorphism of* $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ *such that*

$$\kappa(x_i^{\pm}) = q_i^{\pm 2} x_i^{\pm}, \quad \kappa(k_i^{\pm 1}) = k_i^{\pm 1} \quad (i \in I).$$

Proof. That the formulas in (2) do define an algebra involution of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is easily checked, using 1.3. To prove (3) and (4), we compute $\hat{\omega}(x_0^{\pm})$. Note that, for any $a \in U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\omega}(w_i^{\pm}(a)) &= \hat{\omega}(x^{\pm}_{i,0} a - k_i^{\pm 1} a k_i^{\mp 1} x^{\pm}_{i,0}) \\ &= -(x^{\mp}_{i,0}\hat{\omega}(a) - k_i^{\mp 1}\hat{\omega}(a) k_i^{\pm} x^{\mp}_{i,0}) \\ &= -w_i^{\mp}(\hat{\omega}(a)).\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the formula for the isomorphism f in 1.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\omega}(x_0^{+}) &= -\mu(-1)^k w^{+}_{i_1} \dots w^{+}_{i_k}(x^{+}_{j,-1}) k_\theta \\ &= -\lambda^{-1}\mu(-1)^k q_0^2 x_0^{-},\end{aligned}$$

and, because $\hat{\omega}$ is an involution,

$$\hat{\omega}(x_0^{-}) = -\lambda\mu^{-1}(-1)^k q_0^{-2} x_0^{+}.$$

Equations (3) and (4) are now easily checked on the generators in 1.1. □

It is clear that $\hat{\omega}$ is compatible, via the canonical map $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \to U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, with the Cartan involution ω of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, given by

$$\omega(x_i^{\pm}) = -x_i^{\mp}, \;\; \omega(k_i^{\pm 1}) = k_i^{\mp 1} \quad (i \in I).$$

2 Finite–dimensional representations

Let W be a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, i.e. a (left) $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$–module. One says that $\lambda \in P$ is a weight of W if the weight space

$$W_\lambda = \{w \in W \mid k_i.w = q_i^{\lambda(i)} w\}$$

is non–zero; the set of weights of W is denoted by $P(W)$. We say that W is of type 1 if

$$W = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in P(W)} W_\lambda.$$

The character of W is the function $ch_W : P \to \mathbb{N}$ given by $ch_W(\lambda) = dim(W_\lambda)$.

If W is a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, one says that $w \in W_\lambda$ is a highest weight vector if $x_i^+.w = 0$ for all $i \in I$. If $W = U_q(\mathfrak{g}).w$, one says that W is a highest weight representation with highest weight λ. Lowest weight vectors and representations are defined similarly, by replacing x_i^+ by x_i^-.

For a proof of the following proposition, see [5] or [9].

Proposition 2.1. *(a) Every finite–dimensional representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is completely reducible.*

(b) Every finite–dimensional irreducible representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ can be obtained from a type 1 representation by twisting with an automorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

(c) Every finite–dimensional irreducible representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ of type 1 is both highest and lowest weight. Assigning to such a representation its highest weight defines a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of finite–dimensional irreducible representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and P^+.

(d) The finite–dimensional irreducible representation $V(\lambda)$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ of highest weight $\lambda \in P^+$ has the same character as the irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ of the same highest weight. $\square$

By (a) and (c), if W is any finite–dimensional representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ of type 1, we can write

$$W \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in P^+} V(\lambda)^{\oplus m_\lambda(W)}$$

for some uniquely determined multiplicities $m_\lambda(W) \in \mathbb{N}$. It will be useful to define $m_\lambda(W) = 0$ for $\lambda \in P \backslash P^+$.

Proposition 2.1(continued). *(e) The multiplicities of the irreducible components in the tensor product $V(\lambda) \otimes V(\mu)$, where $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$, is the same as in the tensor product of the irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ of the same highest weight.* $\square$

We now turn to representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. Note that, such a representation V may be regarded as a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ via the canonical homomorphism $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \to U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. We say that V is of type 1 if $c^{1/2}$ acts as the identity on V, and if k_i acts semisimply on V for all $i \in \hat{I}$. Observe that V is then of type 1 as a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$; in particular, the multiplicities $m_\lambda(V)$ $(\lambda \in P)$ are well–defined.

A vector $v \in V$ is a highest weight vector if

$$x^+ .v = 0, \quad \phi^\pm .v = \Phi^\pm v, \quad c^{1/2}.v = v$$

for some complex numbers $\Phi_{i,r}^{\pm}$. If, in addition, $V = U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}).v$, then V is called a highest weight representation, and the pair of $(I\times\mathbb{Z})$-tuples $(\Phi_{i,r}^{\pm})_{i\in I, r\in\mathbb{Z}}$ its highest weight. Note that $\Phi_{i,r}^{+} = 0$ (resp. $\Phi_{i,r}^{-} = 0$) if $r < 0$ (resp. if $r > 0$), and that $\Phi_{i,0}^{+}\Phi_{i,0}^{-} = 1$. (In [5], highest weight representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ are called 'pseudo-highest weight'.) Lowest weight vectors and representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ are defined similarly.

The following result is proved in [5].

Proposition 2.2. *(a) Every finite-dimensional irreducible representation of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ can be obtained from a type 1 representation by twisting with an automorphism of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.*

(b) Every finite-dimensional irreducible representation of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of type 1 is both highest and lowest weight. □

Note, however, that in contrast to the case of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, finite-dimensional representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ are *not* completely reducible, in general.

The next result gives a parametrization of the finite-dimensional irreducible representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of type 1 analogous to that given for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by 2.1(c). If $\mathbf{P} = (P_i)_{i\in I}$ is any I-tuple of polynomials $P_i \in \mathbb{C}[u]$, its degree $deg(\mathbf{P}) \in P^+$ is defined by

$$deg(\mathbf{P})(i) = deg(P_i).$$

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of I-tuples of polynomials with constant term 1, and, for any $\lambda \in P^+$, let

$$\mathcal{P}^\lambda = \{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P} \mid deg(\mathbf{P}) = \lambda\}.$$

Theorem 2.3. *Let V be a finite-dimensional irreducible representation of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of type 1 and highest weight $(\Phi_{i,r}^{\pm})_{i\in I, r\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{P} = (P_i)_{i\in I} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that*

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{i,r}^{+} u^r = q_i^{deg(P_i)} \frac{P_i(q_i^{-2}u)}{P_i(u)} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{i,r}^{-} u^{-r}, \tag{5}$$

in the sense that the left- and right-hand terms are the Laurent expansions of the middle term about 0 and ∞, respectively. Assigning to V the I-tuple $\mathbf{P}$ defines a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of finite-dimensional irreducible representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of type 1 and $\mathcal{P}$. □

This result is proved in [3] when $\mathfrak{g} = sl_2(\mathbb{C})$, in [5] when $\mathfrak{g} = sl_n(\mathbb{C})$, and in [6] in the general case. We denote by $V(\mathbf{P})$ the finite-dimensional irreducible representation of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ associated to $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}$. Abusing notation, we shall say that a representation V as in 2.3 has highest weight $\mathbf{P}$.

The next result describes the behaviour of the representations $V(\mathbf{P})$ under tensor products. If $\mathbf{P} = (P_i)_{i\in I}$, $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_i)_{i\in I} \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\mathbf{P}\otimes\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}$ be the I-tuple $(P_iQ_i)_{i\in I}$. Obviously, $deg(\mathbf{P}\otimes\mathbf{Q}) = deg(\mathbf{P}) + deg(\mathbf{Q})$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}$ be as above, and let $v_{\mathbf{P}}$ and $v_{\mathbf{Q}}$ be highest weight vectors of $V(\mathbf{P})$ and $V(\mathbf{Q})$, respectively. Then, in $V(\mathbf{P})\otimes V(\mathbf{Q})$,*

$$x_{i,r}^{+}.(v_{\mathbf{P}}\otimes v_{\mathbf{Q}}) = 0, \quad \phi_{i,r}^{\pm}.(v_{\mathbf{P}}\otimes v_{\mathbf{Q}}) = \Psi_{i,r}^{\pm}(v_{\mathbf{P}}\otimes v_{\mathbf{Q}}),$$

where the complex numbers $\Psi_{i,r}^{\pm}$ are related to the polynomials P_iQ_i as the $\Phi_{i,r}^{\pm}$ are related to P_i in (5). □

The proof is essentially the same as that given in [3] when $\mathfrak{g} = sl_2(\mathbb{C})$.

Corollary 2.5. *If* $\mathbf{P}$*,* $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}$*,* $V(\mathbf{P} \otimes \mathbf{Q})$ *is isomorphic to a quotient of the subrepresentation of* $V(\mathbf{P}) \otimes V(\mathbf{Q})$ *generated by the tensor product of the highest weight vectors.* $\square$

Let λ_i $(i \in I)$ be the fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\lambda_i(j) = \delta_{ij} \qquad (i, j \in I).$$

For any $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, let $V(\lambda_i, a) = V(\mathbf{P})$, where

$$P_j(u) = \begin{cases} 1 - a^{-1}u & \text{if } j = i, \\ 1 & \text{if } j \neq i. \end{cases}$$

The $V(\lambda_i, a)$ are called the fundamental representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. This terminology is justified by the following consequence of 2.5:

Corollary 2.6. *Every finite-dimensional irreducible representation of* $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ *of type 1 is isomorphic to a subquotient of a tensor product of fundamental representations.* $\square$

3 Minimal affinizations

We propose the following definition.

Definition 3.1. *If* $\lambda \in P^+$*, a finite-dimensional irreducible representation* V *of* $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ *of type 1 is said to be an* affinization *of* λ *if the highest weight* $\mathbf{P}$ *of* V *satisfies* $deg(\mathbf{P}) = \lambda$*. Two affinizations* V *and* V' *of* λ *are said to be* equivalent *if* V *and* V' *are isomorphic as representations of* $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$*.*

Remark 3.2. It follows from 1.3 that, if V is an affinization of λ, then

$$V \cong V(\lambda) \oplus \bigoplus_{\{\mu \in P^+ | \mu < \lambda\}} V(\mu)^{m_\mu(V)}$$

as a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Thus, V gives a way of 'extending' the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ on $V(\lambda)$ to an action of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, at the expense of 'enlarging' $V(\lambda)$ by adding representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ of smaller highest weight.

If V is an affinization of λ, we denote its equivalence class by $[V]$, and we write $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda$ for the set of equivalence classes of affinizations of λ. Note that there is an obvious surjective map $\mathcal{P}^\lambda \to \mathcal{Q}^\lambda$, given by $\mathbf{P} \mapsto [V(\mathbf{P})]$.

One can easily describe $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda$ in case λ is fundamental:

Proposition 3.3. *For any* $i \in I$*,*

$$\mathcal{Q}^{\lambda_i} = \{[V(\lambda_i, 1)]\}.$$

Proof. We need the following lemma, which will also be used elsewhere:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\rho : U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \to End(V)$ be a finite-dimensional irreducible representation of type 1 with highest weight $\mathbf{P} = (P_i)_{i\in I}$. For any $t \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, denote by $\tau_t^*(V)$ the representation $\rho\circ\tau_t$. Then, $\tau_t^*(V)$ has highest weight $\mathbf{P}^t = (P_i^t)_{i\in I}$, where*

$$P_i^t(u) = P_i(tu).$$

Proof. This is immediate from (5), since

$$\tau_t(\phi_{i,r}^{\pm}) = t^{\pm r}\phi_{i,r}^{\pm} \qquad (i \in I,\ r \in \mathbb{Z}). \quad \square$$

If V is an affinization of λ_j, with highest weight $\mathbf{P} = (P_i)_{i\in I}$, say, then $deg(P_i) = \lambda_j(i) = \delta_{ij}$, so $V \cong V(\lambda_j, t)$ as representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, for some $t \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. But then $\tau_t^*(V) \cong V(\lambda_j, 1)$. In particular, $V \cong V(\lambda_j, 1)$ as representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. This proves 3.3. $\square$

For arbitrary $\lambda \in P^+$, we have

Propostion 3.5. *For any $\lambda \in P^+$, $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda$ is a finite set.*

Proof. Let V be an affinization of λ, let $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}^\lambda$ be the highest weight of V, and suppose that

$$P_i(u) = \prod_{r=1}^{\lambda(i)} (1 - a_{i,r}^{-1}u),$$

where $a_{i,r} \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. By 2.5, V is isomorphic to a subquotient of

$$\bigotimes_{i\in I}\left(\bigotimes_{r=1}^{\lambda(i)} V(\lambda_i, a_{i,r})\right)$$

(the terms in the tensor products may be taken in any order). By 2.1(a) and 3.4, V is isomorphic as a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ to a subrepresentation of

$$\bigotimes_{i\in I} V(\lambda_i, 1)^{\otimes\lambda(i)}.$$

Up to isomorphism, this representation obviously has only finitely many subrepresentations, hence 3.5 is proved. $\square$

The rest of this section is devoted to the definition of a natural partial order on $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda$. It is convenient to first define a partial order on a set which contains all of the $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda$. Namely, if $f : P^+ \to \mathbb{N}$ is any function, let

$$supp(f) = \{\lambda \in P^+ \mid f(\lambda) > 0\}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f \in \mathbb{N}^{P^+} \mid supp(f) \text{ is finite}\}.$$

Definition 3.6. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$. We say that $f \preceq g$ iff, for all $\mu \in P^+$, either*

(i) $f(\mu) \le g(\mu)$, or

(ii) there exists $\nu > \mu$ with $f(\nu) < g(\nu)$.

Proposition 3.7. *$\preceq$ is a partial order on $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. That $f \preceq f$, for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, is obvious. If $f \preceq g$ and $g \preceq f$, suppose for a contradiction that there exists $\mu \in P^+$ with $f(\mu) \neq g(\mu)$. Note that, since $supp(f) \cup supp(g)$ is finite, there are at most finitely many such μ, so we may assume that μ is maximal (with respect to the partial order on P^+) among those weights for which $f(\mu) \neq g(\mu)$. Without loss, assume that $f(\mu) < g(\mu)$. Since $g \preceq f$, there exist $\nu > \mu$ with $f(\nu) > g(\nu)$; but this contradicts the maximality of μ.

Suppose finally that $f, g, h \in \mathcal{F}$ are such that $f \preceq g$ and $g \preceq h$, and assume for a contradiction that $f \not\preceq h$. This means that there exists $\mu \in P^+$ such that

$$f(\mu) > h(\mu) \text{ and, for all } \nu > \mu,\ f(\nu) \geq h(\nu). \tag{6}$$

If 3.6(i) holds for f and g, then by (6), $g(\mu) > h(\mu)$. Since $g \preceq h$, there exists $\nu' > \mu$ with $g(\nu') < h(\nu')$. By (6), $f(\nu') \geq h(\nu')$. Thus,

(i)$'$ there exists $\nu' > \mu$ with $g(\nu') < h(\nu') \leq f(\nu')$.

On the other hand, if (3.6)(ii) holds for f and g, then, by (6),

(ii)$'$ there exists $\nu > \mu$ with $h(\nu) \leq f(\nu) < g(\nu)$.

Note that any ν satisfying (ii)$'$ lies in $supp(g)$. Thus, if there exists ν satisfying (ii)$'$, we may assume that ν is maximal with this property. Since $g \preceq h$, there exists $\nu' > \nu$ with $g(\nu') < h(\nu')$. Since $\nu' > \mu$, (6) implies that ν' satisfies (i)$'$. But since $f \preceq g$, there exists $\nu'' > \nu'$ with $f(\nu'') < g(\nu'')$. Then, (6) implies that ν'' satisfies (ii)$'$. Since $\nu'' > \nu$, this contradicts the maximality of ν.

Similarly, assuming that (i)$'$ holds for some ν' also leads to a contradiction. □

If V is an affinization of λ, define $f_V \in \mathcal{F}$ by

$$f_V(\mu) = m_\mu(V), \qquad (\mu \in P^+).$$

It is clear that f_V depends only on the equivalence class of V, and that the map $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda \to \mathcal{F}$ given by $[V] \to f_V$ is injective. Thus, $\preceq$ induces a partial order on $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda$, which we also denote by $\preceq$.

Defintion 3.8. *If $\lambda \in P^+$ and $[V]$, $[W] \in \mathcal{Q}^\lambda$, we write $[V] \preceq [W]$ iff, for all $\mu \in P^+$, either,*

(i) $m_\mu(V) \leq m_\mu(W)$, or

(ii) there exists $\nu > \mu$ with $m_\nu(V) < m_\nu(W)$.

An affinization V of λ is minimal *if $[V]$ is a minimal element of $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda$ for the partial order $\preceq$, i.e. if $[W] \in \mathcal{Q}^\lambda$ and $[W] \preceq [V]$ implies that $[V] = [W]$.*

It follows immediately from 3.5 that

Corollary 3.9. *For any $\lambda \in P^+$, minimal affinizations of λ exist.* □

4 The rank 1 case

In this section, $\mathfrak{g} = sl_2(\mathbb{C})$ and $I = \{1\}$.

Defintion 4.1. *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. The q-*segment *$S_{r,a}$ of length r and centre a is the sequence of non–zero complex numbers $aq^{-r+1}, aq^{-r+3}, \cdots, aq^{r-1}$. Two q–segments S_1 and S_2, of lengths r_1 and r_2, are said to be in* special position *if $S_1 \cup S_2$ is, when suitably ordered, a q-segment of length strictly greater than $max\{r_1, r_2\}$; otherwise, S_1 and S_2 are said to be in* general position.

We recall the main result of [2]:

Theorem 4.2. *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and write*

$$P_{r,a}(u) = \prod_{k=1}^{r}(1 - a^{-1}q^{r-2k+1}u),$$

so that the roots of $P_{r,a}$ are the elements of $S_{r,a}$. Then:

(a) $V(P_{r,a})$ is irreducible as a representation of $U_q(sl_2)$, and has dimension $r+1$;

(b) a tensor product

$$V(P_{r_1,a_1})\otimes V(P_{r_2,a_2})\otimes\cdots\otimes V(P_{r_m,a_m}), \tag{7}$$

where $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, a_2, \ldots a_m \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, is irreducible as a representation of $U_q(\hat{sl}_2)$ iff each pair of strings S_{r_k,a_k}, S_{r_l,a_l}, for $1 \le k < l \le m$, is in general position. Moreover, two irreducible tensor products of the form (7) are isomorphic as representations of $U_q(\hat{sl}_2)$ iff one is obtained from the other by permuting the factors in the tensor product;

(c) every finite–dimensional irreducible representation of $U_q(\hat{sl}_2)$ of type 1 is isomorphic to a tensor product of the form (7). $\square$

Corollary 4.3. *For any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{Q}^{r\lambda_1}$ has a unique minimal element. This element is represented by $V(P)$, where P is any polynomial of degree r whose roots form a q–segment. If $[W] \in \mathcal{Q}^{r\lambda_1}$ is not minimal, then $m_{(r-2)\lambda_1}(W) > 0$.*

Proof. The first part is immediate from 4.2 and 3.4. If $[W] \in \mathcal{Q}^{r\lambda_1}$ is not minimal, then by 4.2(c),

$$W \cong V(P_{r_1,a_1})\otimes\cdots\otimes V(P_{r_m,a_m})$$

where $r_1 + \cdots + r_m = r$ and $m > 1$. By 2.1(e) and the well–known Clebsch–Gordan decomposition for representations of $sl_2(\mathbb{C})$, the second part of 4.3 follows. $\square$

We record the following result here, as it will be needed later. It is an immediate consequence of Propsition 4.9 in [3].

Proposition 4.4. *Let $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$, $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, and let v, w be $U_q(\hat{sl}_2)$ highest weight vectors in $V(P_{r,a})$, $V(P_{s,b})$, respectively. Then, $W = U_q(\hat{sl}_2).(v\otimes w)$ is a proper $U_q(\hat{sl}_2)$–subrepresentation of $V = V(P_{r,a})\otimes V(P_{s,b})$ iff $b/a = q^{r+s-2p+2}$ for some $0 < p \le min\{r, s\}$. In that case, W and V/W are irreducible as representations of $U_q(\hat{sl}_2)$, and as representations of $U_q(sl_2)$,*

$$W \cong V((r+s)\lambda_1)\oplus V((r+s-2)\lambda_1)\oplus\cdots\oplus V((r+s-2p+2)\lambda_1),$$
$$V/W \cong V((r+s-2p)\lambda_1)\oplus V((r+s-2p-2)\lambda_1)\oplus\cdots\oplus V(|r-s|\lambda_1). \quad \square$$

5 The rank 2 case

In this section, $\mathfrak{g}$ is of rank 2 and $I = \{1, 2\}$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\lambda = r_1\lambda_1 + r_2\lambda_2 \in P^+$. Then, $\mathcal{Q}^\lambda$ has a unique minimal element. This element is represented by $V(\mathbf{P})$, where $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}^\lambda$, iff the following two conditions are satisfied:*

(a) for each $i = 1, 2$, either $P_i = 1$ or the roots of P_i form a q_i-segment of length r_i and centre a_i (say);

(b) if $P_1 \neq 1$ and $P_2 \neq 1$, then

$$\frac{a_1}{a_2} = q^{d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_2-1} \quad or \quad q^{-(d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_1-1)}.$$

The proof of 5.1 will occupy the remainder of this section. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_2, it is proved in [4]. From now on, we assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type C_2 or G_2.

Proof of 5.1(a). To prove that 5.1(a) is necessary, we need the following two lemmas. To state the first lemma, we note that, for each $i = 1, 2$, there is an algebra homomorphism $U_{q_i}(\hat{sl}_2) \to U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ such that $x^\pm_{1,r} \mapsto x^\pm_{i,r}$, $k_1 \mapsto k_i$, $h_{1,r} \mapsto h_{i,r}$ (this is clear from 1.3). Let $\hat{U}_i$ be the image of this map.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ and let $v_\mathbf{P}$ be a highest weight vector of $V(\mathbf{P})$. Then, for each $i = 1, 2$, $\hat{U}_i.v_\mathbf{P}$ is an irreducible representation of $U_{q_i}(\hat{sl}_2)$.*

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\lambda \in P^+$, $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}^\lambda$.*

(a) If $P_i \neq 1$ and the roots of P_i do not form a q_i-segment, then $m_{\lambda-\alpha_i}(V(\mathbf{P})) > 0$.

(b) If $P_i = 1$, or if $P_i \neq 1$ and the roots of P_i form a q_i-segment, then, for all $r > 0$, $m_{\lambda-r\alpha_i}(V(\mathbf{P})) = 0$.

Assuming these lemmas, suppose that $V(\mathbf{P})$ is minimal but that, for some $i \in I$, $P_i \neq 1$ and the roots of P_i do not form a q_i-segment. Let $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_j)_{j\in I} \in \mathcal{P}^\lambda$ be such that, for $j = 1, 2$, if $Q_j \neq 1$ the roots of Q_j form a q_j-segment. We claim that $[V(\mathbf{Q})] \prec [V(\mathbf{P})]$.

Let $\mu \in P^+$ be such that $m_\mu(V(\mathbf{Q})) > 0$, $\mu \neq \lambda$. By 5.3(b), $\mu = \lambda - s_1\alpha_1 - s_2\alpha_2$, where s_1, $s_2 > 0$. Hence, $\mu < \lambda - \alpha_i$, and, by 5.3(a),

$$m_{\lambda-\alpha_i}(V(\mathbf{P})) > 0, \quad m_{\lambda-\alpha_i}(V(\mathbf{Q})) = 0,$$

so μ satisfies 3.8(ii). This proves our claim, and hence also that 5.1(a) is necessary.

Proof of 5.2. Suppose that $\hat{U}_i.v_\mathbf{P}$ is reducible. Then, by 2.2(b), there exists $v \in \hat{U}_i.v_\mathbf{P}$, not a multiple of $v_\mathbf{P}$, such that v is annihilated by $x^+_{i,r}$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and is an eigenvector of k_i. It is easy to see from the relations in 1.3 that the set of such vectors v is preserved by the action of the $\phi^\pm_{j,s}$, for all $j \in I$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, we may assume that

$$\phi^\pm_{j,s}.v = \Phi^\pm_{j,s}v \qquad (j \in I,\ s \in \mathbb{Z})$$

for some $\Phi^\pm_{j,s} \in \mathbb{C}$. In particular, v is a common eigenvector of k_1 and k_2, and since $v \in \hat{U}_i.v_\mathbf{P}$, its weight is clearly of the form $\lambda - t\alpha_i$ for some $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, $x^+_{j,r}.v = 0$ for $j \neq i$ as well. This shows that v is a $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$–highest weight vector, which contradicts the irreducibility of $V(\mathbf{P})$. $\square$

Proof of 5.3. (a) By 5.2, $\hat{U}_i.v_\mathbf{P}$ is irreducible as a representation of $U_{q_i}(\hat{sl}_2)$. By 4.3, there exists $0 \neq v \in \hat{U}_i.v_\mathbf{P} \cap V(\mathbf{P})_{\lambda-\alpha_i}$ such that $x^+_{i,0}.v = 0$. Clearly then $x^+_{j,0}.v = 0$

(b) If $P_i = 1$, the statement is clear, since then $\lambda - r\alpha_i \notin P^+$. Let $P_i \neq 1$ be such that the roots of P_i form a q_i–segment. If $m_{\lambda - r\alpha_i}(V(\mathbf{P})) \neq 0$, then, by 1.4, we see that there exists $0 \neq v \in V(\mathbf{P})_{\lambda - r\alpha_i} \cap \hat{U}_i.v_{\mathbf{P}}$ such that $x_{i,0}^+.v = 0$. But, by 5.2 and 4.2(a), $\hat{U}_i.v_{\mathbf{P}}$ is irreducible as a representation of $U_{q_i}(sl_2)$, so this is impossible. $\square$

Before showing that 5.1(b) holds, we show that if one of P_1, P_2 is equal to 1, say P_1 without loss, and the roots of P_2 form a q_2-segment, then $[V(\mathbf{P})]$ is minimal. For, suppose $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}^\lambda$ is such that $[V(\mathbf{Q})]$ is minimal and $[V(\mathbf{Q})] \preceq [V(\mathbf{P})]$. Then $Q_1 = 1$, and since 5.1(a) is neccessary, the roots of Q_2 form a q_2–segment. But then, for some $t \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, $\tau_t^*(V(\mathbf{Q})) \cong V(\mathbf{P})$ by 3.4, so $[V(\mathbf{Q})] = [V(\mathbf{P})]$ and $[V(\mathbf{P})]$ is minimal. This establishes 5.1 when $r_i = 0$ for some $i = 1, 2$.

From now on, we assume that $P_i \neq 1$, $i = 1, 2$, and that the roots of P_i form a q_i–segment with centre $a_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, $i =$ 1, 2. To complete the proof of 5.1, we need the following two results. Status: RO

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be of type C_2 or G_2, and let $\mu = r_1\lambda_1 + r_2\lambda_2 \in P^+$. Assume that, if $Q_i \neq 1$, the roots of Q_i form a q_i–segment of length r_i and centre b_i.*
(a) If $Q_i = 1$ for some $i = 1, 2$, then, for all $s_i > 0$,

$$m_{\mu - s_i\alpha_i}(V(\mathbf{Q})) = 0, \;\; m_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(V(\mathbf{Q})) = 0.$$

(b) Assume that $Q_i \neq 1$, $i = 1, 2$. Let M be a highest weight representation of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ with highest weight $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}^\mu$ such that

$$m_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(M) = 0, \quad m_{\mu-\alpha_i}(M) = 0, \tag{8}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. Then,

$$\frac{b_1}{b_2} = q^{d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_2-1} \text{ or } q^{-(d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_1-1)}. \tag{9}$$

(c) Assume that $Q_i \neq 1$ and define $\mathbf{Q}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{P}^{r_i\lambda_i}$ as follows:

$$Q_j^{(i)} = \begin{cases} Q_i & \text{if } i = j, \\ 1 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Let v_i be a $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$–highest weight vector in $V(\mathbf{Q}^{(i)})$, and let $M = U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}).(v_i \otimes v_j) \subset V(\mathbf{Q}^{(i)}) \otimes V(\mathbf{Q}^{(j)})$, $i \neq j$. Then

$$m_{\lambda-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(M) = 0 \;\; \text{iff} \; \frac{b_i}{b_j} = q^{-(d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_i-1)}.$$

If $\rho : U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \to End(V)$ is a representation, denote the representation $\rho \circ \hat{\omega}$ by $\hat{\omega}^*(V)$.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be of type C_2 or G_2. Let $\mu = r_1\lambda_1 + r_2\lambda_2 \in P^+$, let $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathcal{P}^\mu$, and let*

$$Q_i(u) = \prod^{r_i}(1 - a_{i,r}^{-1}u) \qquad (i = 1,\ 2).$$

Define polynomials $\overline{Q}_i(u)$ *by*

$$\overline{Q}_i(u)=\prod_{r=1}^{r_i}(1-q_i^2a_{i,r}u).$$

Then, $V(\overline{\mathbf{Q}})\cong\tau_t^*\hat{\omega}^*(V(\mathbf{Q}))$ *for some* $t\in\mathbb{C}^\times$*.*

Assuming these propositions, we complete the proof of 5.1 as follows. Suppose that $[V(\mathbf{P})]$ is minimal but that a_1/a_2 has neither of the values stated in 5.1(b). By 5.3(b), $m_{\lambda-\alpha_i}(V(\mathbf{P}))=0$, so by 5.4(b),

$$m_{\lambda-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(V(\mathbf{P}))>0.$$

Choose $\mathbf{Q}=(Q_i)_{i\in I}\in\mathcal{P}^\lambda$ such that the roots of Q_i form a q_i-segment with centre b_i, where b_1/b_2 has one of the values in 5.1(b). By 5.4(c),

$$m_{\lambda-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(V(\mathbf{Q}))=0.$$

Hence, $[V(\mathbf{Q})]\neq[V(\mathbf{P})]$. If $m_\mu(V(\mathbf{Q}))>0$, $\mu\neq\lambda$, then by 5.4(c), $\mu=\lambda-s_1\alpha_1-s_2\alpha_2$ where $s_1,s_2>0$, and since $\mu\neq\lambda-\alpha_1-\alpha_2$, we have $\mu<\lambda-\alpha_1-\alpha_2$. Hence μ satisfies 3.8(ii), and $[V(\mathbf{Q})]\prec[V(\mathbf{P})]$, contradicting minimality of $[V(\mathbf{P})]$.

Conversely, suppose $\mathbf{P}$ is such that conditions 5.1(a) and 5.1(b) are both satisfied. Choose $\mathbf{Q}=(Q_i)_{i\in I}\in\mathcal{P}^\lambda$ such that $[V(\mathbf{Q})]$ is minimal and $[V(\mathbf{Q})]\preceq[V(\mathbf{P})]$. Since conditions 5.1(a) and (b) are necessary, the roots of Q_i must form a q_i-segment with centre b_i, say, where b_1/b_2 also has one of the values in 5.1(b). If $a_1/a_2=b_1/b_2$, then, by 3.4, $V(\mathbf{Q})\cong\tau_t^*(V(\mathbf{P}))$ for some $t\in\mathbb{C}^\times$, and then $[V(\mathbf{Q})]=[V(\mathbf{P})]$. On the other hand, if $a_1/a_2=q^{d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_2-1}$ (resp. $q^{-(d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_1-1)}$) and $b_1/b_2=q^{-(d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_1-1)}$ (resp. $q^{d_1r_1+d_2r_2+2d_2-1}$), then by 5.5, $V(\mathbf{Q})\cong\hat{\omega}^*(V(\mathbf{P}))$, and again $[V(\mathbf{Q})]=[V(\mathbf{P})]$. In both cases, $[V(\mathbf{P})]$ is minimal.

We continue to assume 5.4 and prove 5.5.

Proof of 5.5. We first reduce to the case when $V(\mathbf{Q})$ is fundamental. By 2.6, $V(\mathbf{Q})$ is isomorphic to the unique irreducible subquotient of

$$\bigotimes_{i\in I}\bigotimes_{r=1}^{r_i}V(\lambda_i,a_{i,r})$$

which contains a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$–subrepresentation isomorphic to $V(\mu)$, and hence $\hat{\omega}^*(V(\mathbf{Q}))$ is isomorphic to the unique irreducible subquotient of

$$\hat{\omega}^*\left(\bigotimes_{i\in I}\bigotimes_{r=1}^{r_i}V(\lambda_i,a_{i,r})\right)\cong\bigotimes_{i\in I}\bigotimes_{r=1}^{r_i}\hat{\omega}^*(V(\lambda_i,a_{i,r}))\tag{10}$$

which contains a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-subrepresentation isomorphic to V (the order of the factors in the tensor product on the right–hand side of (10) is the reverse of that on the left–hand side). It is clear that the unique such quotient of

$$\bigotimes\bigotimes_{}^{r_i}V(\lambda_i,ta_{i,r}^{-1})$$

is isomorphic to $(\tau_t^*)^{-1}(V(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}))$.

To prove the result in the fundamental case, note that, by 3.3,

$$\hat{\omega}^*(V(\lambda_i, a_i)) \cong V(\lambda_i, \overline{a}_i), \qquad (i = 1, 2),$$

for some $\overline{a}_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ (not necessarily the complex conjugate of a_i). Assume that $a_1/a_2 = q^{-(3d_1+d_2-1)}$. By 5.9, if v_i is a $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$-highest weight vector in $V(\lambda_i, a_i)$, and $M = U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}).(v_1 \otimes v_2)$, then $m_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(M) = 0$. Clearly, $M' = U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}).(v_2 \otimes v_1) \subseteq \hat{\omega}^*(M)$, hence $m_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(M') = 0$. By 5.9 again,

$$\frac{\overline{a}_2}{\overline{a}_1} = q^{-(d_1+3d_2-1)}.$$

Hence,

$$q_1^2 a_1 \overline{a}_1 = q_2^2 a_2 \overline{a}_2,$$

so the result follows from 3.4. □

Proof of 5.4(a). We assume that $d_2 = 1$.

The fact that $m_{\mu - s_i\alpha_i}(V(\mathbf{Q})) = 0$ follows from 5.3(b). If $Q_1 = 1$ it is enough to notice that $\mu - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \notin P^+$.

If $Q_2 = 1$, we must consider separately the cases when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type C_2 or G_2. Let $v_{\mathbf{Q}}$ be a $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$-highest weight vector of $V(\mathbf{Q})$.

If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type C_2, then $x_0^+.v_{\mathbf{Q}}$ has weight $r_1\lambda_1 - \alpha_1 - 2\alpha_2$, which is Weyl group conjugate to $r_1\lambda_1 - \alpha_1 \in P^+$. Hence, if $m_\nu(V(\mathbf{Q})) > 0$ and $x_0^+.v_{\mathbf{Q}}$ has a non-zero component in a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-subrepresentation of $V(\mathbf{Q})$ of highest weight ν, then $\nu = r_1\lambda_1$ or $r_1\lambda_1 - \alpha_1$. But, $m_{r_1\lambda_1-\alpha_1}(V(\mathbf{Q})) = 0$ by 5.3(b), so $x_0^+.v_{\mathbf{Q}} \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}).v_{\mathbf{Q}} \cong V(r_1\lambda_1)$. Similarly, if $v_{\mathbf{Q}}^*$ is a $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$-lowest weight vector of $V(\mathbf{Q})$, then $x_0^-.v_{\mathbf{Q}}^* \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}).v_{\mathbf{Q}}^* = U_q(\mathfrak{g}).v_{\mathbf{Q}}$. It follows that $x_0^\pm$ preserve $U_q(\mathfrak{g}).v_{\mathbf{Q}}$, and hence that $U_q(\mathfrak{g}).v_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is a $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$-subrepresentation of $V(\mathbf{Q})$. This not only proves 5.4(a), but the following stronger result:

Proposition 5.6. *If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type C_2, where $d_2 = 1$, and if $r \in \mathbb{N}$, then $r\lambda_1$ has an affinization which is irreducible as a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ (this necessarily represents the unique minimal element of $\mathcal{Q}^{r\lambda_1}$).* □

If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type G_2, $x_0^+.v_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is obviously killed by x_2^+, since $[x_2^+, x_0^+] = 0$. Hence, if $x_0^+.v_{\mathbf{Q}}$ has a non–zero component w in a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$–subrepresentation of $V(\mathbf{Q})$ isomorphic to $V(r_1\lambda_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)$, then $x_2^+.w = 0$. This implies that $x_1^+.w \neq 0$ since the weight of w (which is the same as the weight of $x_0^+.v_{\mathbf{Q}}$) is $(r_1 - 1)\lambda_1$ which is less than $r_1\lambda_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2$. But then $(r_1 - 1)\lambda_1 + \alpha_1$, and hence also its Weyl group conjugate $(r_1 - 1)\lambda_1 + \alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2$, is a weight of $V(r_1\lambda_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)$. This is impossible because $(r_1 - 1)\lambda_1 + \alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2 > r_1\lambda_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2$.

The proof of 5.4(a) is now complete.

We assume from now on that $Q_i \neq 1$, $i = 1, 2$. To prove (b) and (c) we shall need the following result.

Lemma 5.7. *Let M be a highest weight $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$–module with highest weight $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}^\mu$, $\mu = r_1\lambda_1 + r_2\lambda_2$, and highest weight vector m. Assume that $m_{\mu-\alpha_i}(M) = 0$. Then,*

(a) for $i = 1, 2$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$h_{i,r}.m = H_{i,r}m, \;\; x^-_{i,r}.m = X_{i,r}x^-_{i,0}.m,$$

for some $H_{i,r}$, $X_{i,r} \in \mathbb{C}$. *If, in addition, the roots of* Q_i *form a* q_i*–segment with centre* b_i, *then*

$$H_{i,1} = q_i^{-1}b_i^{-1}[r_i]_{q_i}, \quad X_{i,1} = b_i^{-1}q_i^{r_i-1}.$$

(b) Let $W \subseteq M$ *be the linear span of* $\{x_1^-x_2^-.m, x_2^-x_1^-.m\}$. *Then, the following are equivalent:*

(i) $x^-_{1,1}x^-_{2,0}.m \in W$;

(ii) $x^-_{i,r}x^-_{j,s}.m \in W$ *for all* $i \neq j \in \{1,2\}$, $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}$;

(iii) $m_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(M) = 0$.

We assume 5.7 and complete the proof of 5.4.

Proof of 5.4(b). Suppose that (8) is satisfied. By 5.7(b), we can write

$$x^-_{1,1}x^-_{2,0}.m = Cx^-_{1,0}x^-_{2,0}.m + Dx^-_{2,0}x^-_{1,0}.m,$$

where C, $D \in \mathbb{C}$. Applying $x^+_{1,0}$, $x^+_{2,0}$ and $x^+_{2,1}$, respectively, to both sides of this equation, and using 5.7(a) and the relations in 1.3, we find the following system of equations for C, D:

$$\begin{aligned} q_1^{-a_{12}}(b_1^{-1}q_1^{r_1-1}[r_1]_{q_1} - [a_{12}]_{q_1}q_1^{r_1}b_2^{-1}q_2^{r_2-1}) &= C[r_1 - a_{12}]_{q_1} + D[r_1]_{q_1}, \\ [r_2]_{q_2}b_1^{-1}q_1^{r_1-1} &= C[r_2]_{q_2} + D[r_2 - a_{21}]_{q_2}, \\ b_1^{-1}b_2^{-1}q_2^{r_2-1}[r_2]_{q_2}q_1^{r_1-1} &= Cb_2^{-1}q_2^{r_2-1}[r_2]_{q_2} + \\ & \quad Dq_2^{-a_{21}}(b_2^{-1}q_2^{r_2-1}[r_2]_{q_2} - [a_{21}]_{q_2}q_2^{r_2}b_1^{-1}q_1^{r_1-1}). \end{aligned}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that these equations are consistent only if (9) holds.

Proof of 5.4(c). We prove this when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type C_2, the G_2 case is similar. By 5.3(b), we know that, for all i, j, $m_{\mu-\alpha_j}(V(\mathbf{Q}^{(i)}) = 0$. Hence, $m_{\mu-\alpha_i}(M) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ and, by 5.7, proving that $m_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(M) = 0$ is equivalent to proving that $[x^-_{j,0}, x^-_{i,1}]_q.(v_i \otimes v_j) = (qx^-_{j,0}x^-_{i,1} - q^{-1}x^-_{i,1}x^-_{j,0}).(v_i \otimes v_j)$ is a linear combination of the following two elements:

$$x^-_{i,0}x^-_{j,0}(v_i \otimes v_j) = x^-_{i,0}.v_i \otimes x^-_{j,0}.v_j + q_i^{-r_i}v_i \otimes x^-_{i,0}x^-_{j,0}.v_j, \tag{11}$$

$$x^-_{j,0}x^-_{i,0}(v_i \otimes v_j) = x^-_{j,0}x^-_{i,0}.v_i \otimes v_j + q_i^{-1}x^-_{i,0}.v_i \otimes x^-_{j,0}.v_j. \tag{12}$$

Note that, by the isomorphism f in 1.3, we have $x_0^+ = [x^-_{2,0}, [x^-_{2,0}, x^-_{1,1}]_q](k_1k_2^2)^{-1}$, from which one deduces that

$$[x_2^+, x_0^+] = (-1)^{\delta_{i,2}}(q^2 - q^{-2})[x^-_{j,0}, x^-_{i,1}]_q(k_1k_2)^{-1}.$$

Using 1.2 and 5.7(a), one finds that

$$[x_2^+, x_0^+](v_i \otimes v_j) = [x_2^+, x_0^+].v_i \otimes k_2k_0.v_j + v_i \otimes [x_2^+, x_0^+].v_j$$

It is easy to see that this element is a linear combination of the elements in (11) and (12) if and only if

$$\frac{b_i}{b_j} = q^{-(d_1 r_1 + d_2 r_2 + 2d_i - 1)}. \quad \square$$

Finally, we give the

Proof of 5.7. (a) That m is a common eigenvector of the $h_{i,r}$ is a consequence of the fact that m is the highest weight vector of M and of the relation between the $\phi_{i,r}^{\pm}$ and the $h_{i,r}$ given in 1.3. If the roots of Q_i form a q_i–segment, then, by using (5), it follows immediately that the eigenvalue of $h_{i,1}$ is as given. To see that $x_{i,r}^{-}.m$ is a multiple of $x_{i,0}^{-}.m$, it suffices to note that, in view of the relations in 1.3, $x_{i,0}^{+}$ kills a suitable linear combination of $x_{i,r}^{-}.m$ and $x_{i,0}^{-}.m$.

(b) By 5.7(a), to prove that (i) implies (ii), it suffices to prove that $x_{i,r}^{-}x_{j,0}^{-}.m \in W$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i \neq j$. By the following relation in $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, and an obvious induction on r, we may assume that $i = 1$, $j = 2$:

$$x_{2,r}^{-}x_{1,s}^{-} - q^{-a_{21}}x_{1,s}^{-}x_{2,r}^{-} = q^{-a_{21}}x_{2,r-1}^{-}x_{1,s+1}^{-} - x_{1,s+1}^{-}x_{2,r-1}^{-}.$$

Since we are given that $x_{1,1}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m \in W$, we are reduced to proving the following statement:

(13) if $x_{1,r}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m \in W$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $x_{1,r\pm 1}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m \in W$.

To prove (13), note first that the relation

$$[h_{i,r}, x_{j,s}^{-}] = -\frac{1}{r}[ra_{ij}]_{q^i} c^{|r|/2} x_{j,r+s}^{-},$$

in $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, and the fact that $c^{1/2}$ acts as the identity on M, imply that there exist elements $H_r \in U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, which are linear combinations of $h_{i,\pm r}$, $i = 1, 2$, such that, for all $m' \in M$, $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$[H_s, x_{i,r}^{-}].m' = \delta_{i1}x_{i,r+s}^{-}.m'.$$

Now, (13) will follow if we prove that $H_{\pm 1}.W \subseteq W$. For H_1, this follows from 5.7(a) and the assumption that $x_{1,1}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m \in W$. For H_{-1}, it suffices similarly to prove that $x_{1,-1}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m \in W$. By assumption, we can write

(14) $$x_{1,1}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m = Ax_{1,0}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m + Bx_{2,0}^{-}x_{1,0}^{-}.m,$$

for some $A, B \in \mathbb{C}$. If $A \neq 0$, applying H_{-1} to both sides of (14) gives the desired conclusion. If $A = 0$, we use the same argument with H_{-2} to get $x_{1,-1}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m \in W$.

To prove that (ii) implies (iii), note that, by 1.4, $M_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}$ is spanned by $\{x_{i,r}^{-}x_{j,s}^{-}.m\}_{i,j=1,2,r,s\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Hence, $M_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2} = W$. Since $W \subseteq U_q(\mathfrak{g}).m \cong V(\mu)$, $m_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}(M) = 0$.

For (iii) implies (i), suppose for a contradiction that $x_{1,1}^{-}x_{2,0}^{-}.m \notin W$. Then $dim(M_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}) \geq 3$. But, $dim(V(\mu)_{\mu-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}) = 2$. Since $m_{\mu-\alpha_i}(M) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, we must have m $(M) > 0$.

References

1. Beck, J., Braid group action and quantum affine algebras, preprint, MIT, 1993.
2. Chari, V. and Pressley, A. N., New unitary representations of loop groups, Math. Ann. **275** (1986), 87-104.
3. Chari, V. and Pressley, A. N., Quantum affine algebras, Commun. Math. Phys. **142** (1991), 261-83.
4. Chari, V. and Pressley, A. N., Small representations of quantum affine algebras, Lett. Math. Phys. **30** (1994), 131-45.
5. Chari, V. and Pressley, A. N., *A Guide to Quantum Groups*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
6. Chari, V. and Pressley, A. N., Quantum affine algebras and their representations, preprint, 1994.
7. Drinfel'd, V. G., A new realization of Yangians and quantized affine algebras, Soviet Math. Dokl. **36** (1988), 212-6.
8. Frenkel, I.B. and Reshetikhin, N. Yu., Quantum affine algebras and holonomic difference equations, Commun. Math. Phys. **146** (1992), 1-60.
9. Lusztig, G., *Introduction to Quantum Groups*, Progress in Mathematics 110, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993.